

Pamph
R Theol
W

Our Protestant Banners and their Erection:

A SERMON,

DELIVERED TO THE ORANGEMEN OF KINGSTON
AND VICINITY IN THE CITY PARK ON THE 13th JULY, 1863.

BY REV. A. WILSON,

Minister of the Brock Street Presbyterian Church.

329153
20.7.36

KINGSTON :

PRINTED AT THE BRITISH AMERICAN OFFICE,
1863.

W
R. J. H. 501
1876

SERMON.

PSALM XX 5.—“We will rejoice in thy Salvation, and in the name of our God will we set up our Banners.”

The greatest event that has ever transpired in our world is the death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is an event fought with more glory to God and more and greater blessings to man than any other that has been, or will ever be, recorded in the page of history or in the annals of time. The Salvation which has hereby been accomplished, is a Salvation pre-eminently of God—a Salvation planned by God, the Father, executed by God, the Son, and applied to believers by God, the Holy Spirit. In this Salvation it is our privilege, as well as our duty, at all times, to rejoice. “We will rejoice in thy Salvation.”

Whatever reference there may be in the text, however, to this glorious and eternal Salvation, which has been wrought out by the Redeemer and King of Zion, of whom David was an eminent type, there is, undoubtedly, a reference to other great and important events in the Providence of God, which were accomplished on behalf of his Church and people, on account of which they ought to rejoice. To many of these we could refer, which took place both before and after, as well as, in the time of David. May we not, also, with propriety, apply the words of our text to many more which has occurred since the commencement of the present dispensation? May we not apply them to the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, and other great and important events which have since then transpired, and say, in relation to them—“we will rejoice in thy Salvation?” Among the latter, have we not good reasons for placing the important and glorious events of 1688 and 1690, which this day you are assembled to commemorate? In reference to these never-to-be forgotten events, fraught as they are, with so many and so great blessings, both of a civil and religious kind, may we not say, shall we not say this day, “we will rejoice in thy Salvation?”

But it is from the latter part of the text we propose at present to discourse—“In the name of our God we will set up our Banners.”

I. OUR BANNERS.

1st. How shall I describe them? A full description of them would occupy too much of your time on this auspicious occasion. I must confine myself to but a few remarks upon what may be called the *warp* and the *woof* of our Protestant Banners. What, then, is that warp and what that woof? Are they not, first, the right of private judgment; and second, the supreme authority of God's written word in all matters of faith and practice?

They may be viewed both negatively and positively. Viewed, negatively, the right of private judgment is just the denial of the right of any man or body of men to dictate to me or any other man what we

are to believe and practice in religious matters, so as to impose upon us an obligation to believe and practice them. But it is to be viewed positively ; for if no man or body of men has the right to prescribe to me what I am to believe and practice, then it follows that I must form my opinion for myself—that I have a right to do so—that I am under obligation to do so—and that it is my privilege, as well as duty, to “be fully persuaded in my own mind.”

The exclusive authority of the written word of God as the only rule of faith and practice, considered negatively, is just a denial that there is any other source from which the will of God on matters of religion can be fully and certainly learned. In its positive form, it is the ascertion of the sufficiency of the written word in point of fullness and clearness, perfection or completeness, as a rule of faith and practice. This does not imply, as papists assert, that men may put any interpretation upon the word of God which they may see fit, no more than the right of private judgment implies that we may adopt any opinions we may think proper. To God we are accountable for the right exercise of private judgment, and to him we are also accountable for the right interpretation and use of His Holy word.

Now these are the *warps* and these are the *woofs* of our Protestant Banners. They include many and important threads of which you can easily think, at your leisure, for yourselves.

2. These are, we remark, in the second place, Banners of truth and antagonistic to error. Let these Banners be set up and the errors and superstitions of popery must retire to the darkness of that Kingdom, the Kingdom of Satan, whence they came and to which they belong. Let them be set up in the man, in the church, in the nation and justification by faith takes the place of the Tridentine doctrine of justification by the sacraments. “The priest,” in the words of a writer, “becomes a minister and the altar a communion table. The bread and the wine are no longer the body and blood of Christ, but the memorial of these. The impious immolation of the mass is turned into a sweet and holy feast, and the mutterings of the priest into the pastor’s prayer. The devotee kneeling to the bread and robbed of the cup, is regenerated into the communicant, sitting as the disciples sat, to receive the broken break and to drink of the cup of blessing, which, in the master’s name, we bless. The temple becomes a house of prayer ; the preaching of Christ supersedes the elevation of the host ; the hearing ear takes the place of the stupid stare ; the lacerations of penance are exchanged for the sighs of penitence ; the closet banishes the confessional ; and the believer’s act of faith, receiving Christ as the Saviour, supplants for ever the Auto da Fe of the Inquisitor, committing God’s chosen ones to the flames. How quickly, how utterly, does the true doctrine exterminate the idolatrous ritual of Rome ! Away go surplice, tonsure, rosary, bowings, kneelings, mutterings and antiphonies ; away, away go crucifixes, paintings, images, dead men’s bones, incense, lighted candles, the sign of the cross, masses for the dead and indulgences for the living. All these symbols of a baptized idolatry do unquestionably proceed from the Romish theology ; even so every corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. But how simple and spiritual the worship prescribed by our theology—the reading of the word, the song of praise, the prayer, the sermon, the baptism, the supper and the blessing upon the people ! Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit.”

3rd. They are Banners, we again remark, of true rational liberty,

opposed to bondage of whatever kind ; whether mental, moral, ecclesiastical or civil. "The faithful and true witness" has said, "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," John, 8, 32, "All sin, wrongs, oppression, cruelties, crimes of every kind," says Dr. Guthrie, "stand on falsehood. The fall of man was wrought by a lie ; our first mother, like thousands of her daughters, having been seduced from the pathes of virtue. Tyranny rests on a lie !—that kings have a divine right to reign and subjects under a divine obligation to obey. Slavery rests on a lie !—that man can hold property in man, and buy and sell his brother. Persecution rests on a lie !—that man has no right of private judgment, and is answerable for his faith to other than God." Now the truth on all matters, moral and religious, is contained in the written word of God, and it is through this truth, as well as by the subjective work of the Holy Spirit, that Christ makes men free "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." An open and a free Bible, with the right of private judgment is, therefore, the very palladium of all true liberty. Hence, the opposition of popery to a free bible and bible societies—to bible readers and bible circulation. The principles of the papacy, are opposed to and inconsistent with the liberty of men to think for themselves, to worship God for themselves, in short, to all mental, religious and civil liberty. The words of the Rev. Dr. Hetherington, Professor of Divinity, Theological College, Glasgow, are in point here. "It (papacy) claims," he says, "absolute and irresponsible supremacy over the whole nature of man. It claims the right of dictating what he is to believe in religion, how he is to worship, and what obedience he is to render ; while it will not permit him to read the word of God, and learn there what God himself has taught and requires. It claims the right of taking away personal responsibility, controlling or extinguishing conscience, and exercising supremacy over every principle of moral duty, public or domestic. It arrogates even the power of domineering over reason and intellect, guiding the pursuits of science and controlling its results, not only in a former age, as in the well known case of Galileo, but in modern times, as in the insane like declaration of Dr. Paul Cullen, pretended Primate of Ireland, against the demonstrated conclusion of the Newtonian philosophy. It thus, to the utmost of its power, reduces man to the extreme of mental and moral degradation, to utter and object salavery of both soul and body. And to complete the enormity of its character and conduct, it seeks to persecute and destroy, even to absolute extermination, all who will not yield implicit subjection to its arrogant and despotic claims. Of this all history, for more than a thousand years, furnishes ample proof in the blood-stained pages that record the horrors of Popish persecution. Could the valleys of Piedmont re-echo the cries of the perishing Waldenses—could the dungeons of the Inquisition utter in articulate language the groans and shrieks that resounded in their gloomy depths—could the tongues of flame that licked the blood of martyrs among the fires of Smithfield speak—then might the hideous tale of Popish persecution be fully told—prolonged, as it would be till our own day, by the shrill cries from Madeira, and wild voices from Tahiti, and deep groans from Rome, Naples, and Sicily." Every Bishop, before his consecration, is sworn not only to "assist to retain and defend against every man, the Romish Papacy and the *royalties* of St. Peter, to be careful to preserve, defend, enlarge, and promote the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church, and of our

Lord, the Pope and his successors, but, also, to the *utmost of his power persecute and oppose* all heretics, schismatics and rebels against our said Lord and his successors." And the late Dr. Troy, late popish Archbishop of Dublin, in an exposition of the XVII,6, and XXII,8, of the book of Revelation, says, "when Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishment in other countries, their blood is not called the blood of the Saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, or other malefactors, for the shedding of which no common-wealth will answer."

4th. That these Banners are what we thus claim for them is abundantly proved by the history of the past and the present. When they were adopted by Luther, when he read the sacred page for himself and exercised the right of private judgment, he burst the bonds of popish thralldom, and abandoning the error and superstitions of Rome, affixed to the door of the church of Wittenberg, his famous ninety-five propositions, and thus protested against the doctrine of indulgence. You know the results, not only in Germany and other nations of the continent, but in the world. There followed, as you know, from his labors and those of his coadjutors in his own and other lands, the greatest reformation the world has ever seen. "Not only was pure religion revived at the period of the Reformation, but the human intellect was inspired with new activity. It was an easy task to trace, the intellectual awakening to the theology of the Reformers. The doctrine of justification by faith alone was, perhaps, their first great discovery. When five of the seven sacraments were discarded as fraudulent, and the two that remained were wrested from their superstitious uses. Next, the word of God was rescued both from the hierarchy and the unknown tongue which concealed its light. A step further revealed the fundamental principle that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Under the increasing light and power of these successive discoveries, sacerdotalism, ritualism, the sanctity of tradition, the legends of saints, the dreams of the fathers, the insolence and fraud of priest-craft, and the credulity and sterility of its subjects withered away. The human mind so long darkened, or intimidated, or smothered by the mediæval faith and worship, now experienced the vitalizing impulse of the apostolic theology. Other systems have inflamed the ardour of leading minds, but this communicated an upheaving force to the masses. Never since the days of the Apostles had there been such a wide spread and wonder-working excitement. It was a spiritual and intellectual resurrection, "the dead were raised, the soul dead in sin and the intellect dead in imbecility were made alive." These Banners, had they been permanently set up, protected and waved over the sunny plains of France, would have saved her from a bloody revolution, the foul blot of the Saint Bartholomew massacre, and exalted her to the highest place among the nations of the world. Opposition to and rejection of them has reduced Spain, in every respect, to the lowest place among kingdoms, and the cries of Matamoras with those of his two companions who this day lie in the prison of Granada, under sentence of nine years imprisonment, simply for reading the Bible and endeavoring to induce others to read it, ascend to heaven for justice, while they, at the same time, bear witness, in the face of all the nations, to the oppression of popery and popish states. Planted, unfurled and protected in Holland, they raised up from its marshes that mighty Dutch Republic, amidst many material disadvantages, which

in its very cradle, grappled with Spain and drove back in disgrace the haughty usurper. Notwithstanding the boast of the Duke of Alva, that he had, within five years, delivered eighteen thousand heretics to the executioner, her states became independent and free, her colonies girdled the world, her fleet covered the seas, and under the influence of these Banners, she rose to the position in which she was able to give England, in her time of need, a glorious defender of civil and religious liberty. Need I speak of what they have done for Scotland, on whose gray hills they were planted and defended, with tears and prayers, by Knox, and Henderson, Argyle and the hunted and hated covenanters? From her earliest struggle with popery, to her last great contest for Christ's Crown, and covenant, these Banners have always stood like her own Benlomond transmuting, the very storms that have raged around her own unwrinkled brow into fountains of gushing purity until she has become a very garden of truth and liberty. Born upward and upward by the Puritains and others of England, unfolded in the pulpit by eminent divines, espoused by great statemen and defended by illustrious commanders in the battle field, they drove from the throne of Great Britain and Ireland the tyranical and persecuting Stewarts, brought from Holland and placed in their room that illustrious Prince of Orange, and infused into the British constitution the very soul of civil and religious liberty, until that constitution became the richest repository on earth of free principles.

II. THE ERECTION OF OUR BANNERS.

"In the name of God will we set up our Banners." These Banners have been set up, ought ever to be set up, and can only be efficiently and successfully set up in the name of our God. This may denote :—

1st. That it is by His authority they are to be erected. He is Lord of the conscience and we are required by Him to consider and determine for ourselves. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And we will be held responsible by God for the opinions we have entertained, as well as our actions in life. The Bible is his living word and comes to us with all the authority of the Lord of Hosts, demanding our reception of it as such, our hearty assent to its sublime truths, and our support and dissemination of them in the world. "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent and believe the Gospel." "Ye are the light of the world." "Let your light so shine before men, that others seeing your good works may glorify your Father who is in Heaven."

2nd. That it is to be, in the second place, by his assistance. It is only as we obtain light and help from above, that we can make a right and profitable use of private judgment, or receive, maintain and disseminate aright the written word of God. But He has ever been on the side of our Protestant Banners. Past history fully evinces this. As He was with His ancient people at the Red Sea, in their escape from Egyptian bondage, to give them deliverance from and victory over their oppressors; so He has ever been on the side of His church and people, to aid them against the oppression and persecution of popery. It was of His special Providence that Henry the VIII, rejected the Pope's supremacy and England became reformed and free. When the so called Invincible Armada of Spain, was provided and equipped for the purpose of subjugating her again to the dominion of Rome, the Admiral was seized and prostrated with a fever, and England obtained

time to prepare for defence. When this formidable fleet at length set sail and onward sped, in the form of a crescent, elated with pride and sure of an easy conquest, the elements of nature fought on the side of our Banners, and with the wind and the waves on her side, England was victorious and her Protestantism was saved. When Ireland was chosen as an asylum and field of operations by a popish King, driven from the throne of England as unfit, from his popish principles and practices, to rule that protestant nation, God was on our side and he was driven from the Emerald Isle, no more to trouble and oppress the people and church of God. And in that patience, endurance and steadfastness to the truth, amidst indescribable sufferings, granted the martyrs of every nation, we recognize the Divine presence and assistance, as well as in the more marked events, of His special providence.

3. But it was not without the efforts and sufferings of those who adhered to these Banners that they have been set up. To this all history testifies. We will not now speak of the doings and sufferings of God's people in France and Spain, in Holland and Switzerland, where those faithful to the truth, the Waldenses and Albegenses, so long and so successfully contended against the usurpations and corruptions of Rome. But let us at once turn to the British Islands. Let Scotland testify to how these Banners were set up. Let the Bass Rock, let the Grassmarket and Gray Friars' Church yard, in Edinburgh. let the national covenant, of 1638, which was signed in that church and church yard with such profound solemnity and intense enthusiasm, many opening veins and signing with their own blood, tell. That was a great day in Scotland and a glorious erection of these Banners. And seeing that old covenant is so much neglected, let me give you an extract from it, to show you how the fathers in Scotland then felt and spoke, wrote and covenanted in relation to popery. After a suitable preamble it is written in that covenant, namely :—"And, therefore, we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine ; but chiefly all kinds of Papistry in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the word of God and the kirk of Scotland. But, in special, we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist upon the scriptures of God, upon the kirk, the civil magistrate and consciences of men ; all his tyrannous laws made upon indifferent things against our Christian liberty ; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written word, the perfection of the Law, the office of Christ, and his blessed evangel ; his corrupted doctrine concerning original sin, our natural inability and rebellion to God's law, our justification by faith only, our imperfect sanctification and obedience to the law ; the nature, number, and use of the holy sacraments ; his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the true sacraments without the word of God ; his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament ; his absolute necessity of baptism ; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation, or real presence of Christs body in the elements, and receiving of the same by the wicked, or bodies of men ; . . . his devilish mass ; his blasphemous priesthood ; his profane sacrifice for sins of the dead and quick ; his cannonization of men ; calling upon angels and saints departed, worshiping of imagery, relicks and crosses ; dedicating of kirks, altars, days ; vows to creatures ; his purgatory ; prayers for the dead ; his worldly monarchy and wicked hierarchy ; . . his three solemn vows with his shavellings of sundry sorts ; his erroneous

and bloody decrees made at Trent, with all the subscribers or approvers of that cruel and bloody band conjured against the kirk of God." Such are some of the terms in which those Protestants of former times protested against the errors of the Man of Sin. There was none of that squeamishness about them which is so frequently manifested by Protestants of our day in relation to popery. We might speak also of the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, entered into by the three kingdoms for, among other things, "the extirpation of popery" of which Doctor Hetherington has said, in his history of the Church of Scotland, that it is "the noblest in its essential nature and principles, of all that are recorded among the international transactions of the world." "There can be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent and thoughtful man, that on it mainly rests, under Providence, the noble structure of the British constitution. But for it, as far as man can judge, these kingdoms would have been placed beneath the deadening bondage of absolute despotism, and in the fate of Britain, the liberty and civilization of the world would have sustained a fatal paralyzing shock."

But we turn to England where the doings and sufferings of her noble sons tell us how they rallied around and stood by these Banners of Protestantism. Time would fail us to tell of her Smithfield and her monuments erected to the memory of those who fell in the struggle for civil and religious liberty. The doings and sufferings of her Latimer, Ridleys, Cranmers and Rogerses, will ever be remembered. And the noble stand taken by the Puritans for truth and freedom in 1662, when two thousand ministers cheerfully left their homes, their congregations and their livings rather than conform to what they regarded as inconsistent with the word of God, and the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, will speak for truth and freedom to the latest generations. The Bicentenary of this great event was suitably celebrated last year in Great Britain and Ireland. In turning to Ireland I need only say, let Derry's gates and Derry's walls, with roaring Mag and Walker's monument, let the Boyne, where the heroic Schomberg fell, and William, Prince of Orange, struck a death blow at the interests of those who sought to banish civil and religious liberty from Great Britain and Ireland, and to establish the tyranny of "that Man of Sin," "the Son of perdition," whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, shall destroy with the brightness of His coming," tell how they were erected in the Emerald Isle.

III. We propose, in the third place, to enquire how these Banners are being set up at the present, and how professed Protestants rally around them, sustain them, bear them upward and onward against error and oppression, and in favor of the truth and freedom. This is a legitimate question. It arises naturally from the subject. No doubt it is a practical one, and will bring the matter home to ourselves. But unless our subject is brought home to ourselves and bears practically upon the present, showing us what is present duty, reproving us for past neglect and unfaithfulness to the sacred trust committed to us, and animating us to the performance of our duty in the future, we shall have discoursed to you in vain.

There is much in the present, bearing upon the erection of these Banners, for which we should thank God and take courage—much in modern missions—much in modern Bible circulation—and much in the present aspect of Providence. The changes and revolutions which have taken place in our day and in the old world, are all in favor of

truth and freedom. And we cannot but regard the present sanguinary and unnatural war, now being so fiercely waged in the once United but now divided States, as in the cause, whether intentionally on the part of man or not, of truth and freedom.

But, on the other hand, there is much not only to be regretted but to excite anxiety and even alarm.

1st. The indifference and ignorance, so prevalent in our day, in relation to the nature and tendency of popery is to be regretted. There are comparatively few acquainted with its errors as they ought to be. Many think that popery is changed from what it was in former times; as if that which claims infallibility could change. Others there are who have come to look upon this Antichrist as a section of the visible church of Christ, entitled to the same respect and support as any portion of Christ's church. Some protestant churches too recognize as valid the baptism of the church of Rome, and one at least, which some of its friends regard as the only Protestant church upon earth, acknowledges her ordination and receives her massing priests to officiate in her desks and pulpits without re-ordination. No wonder there are so many Tractarians and semi-papists within her pale.

2. Again, it is sad to see to what an extent Protestant governments and Protestants countenance and support the papacy, which has ever sought to deprive man of the right of private judgment and the free use of God's holy word, and whose essential principles are opposed to all civil and religious freedom—it is amazing, to see the change, in this respect, that has come over Great Britain—amazing when we consider the nature of the British constitution. Is it not essentially Protestant? Was it not founded upon the following resolutions passed by the Lords and Commons in 1688, namely, “that King James the Second—having endeavored to subvert the constitution of the kingdom by breaking the original contract (i.e., inter alia, the oath to maintain the Protestant religion and the Protestantism of the constitution) between King and people; and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws; and having withdrawn himself out of the Kingdom—had abdicated the government, and that the throne had thereby become vacant”—“that it was inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant nation to be governed by a Popish King” Are not the throne and constitution founded upon the Bible? In administering the coronation oath to our beloved Queen, the Archbishop of Canterbury said, “will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by law?” The Queen answered, “I will.” After this her Majesty, laying her hands upon the Gospel, said: “The things which I have heretofore promised, I will perform and keep, so help me God.” Not only so, but before she could wear the Crown, it was necessary for her to make, and she did make, the following declaration against Popery:—“I, Victoria, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever, and that the *Invocation* and *Adoration* of the *Virgin Mary* or *any other Saint* and the *sacrifice* of the *Mass*, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are *Superstitious* and *idolatrous*.” Every Protestant member, too, of the British Parliament is sworn to support the constitution and its Protes-

tantism. Every popish member is sworn not only to support it but "Never to exercise any privilege to which he is or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the *Protestant religion* or *Protestant government* in the United Kingdom." Thus we have the Queen, on the one side declaring that she will defend and maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion; and on the other side of the contract, two groups of representatives of the people—the one swearing in a positive form; the other, both negatively and positively to the same effect. Yet see how offices of state are being filled, as they were in the days of James, the II, of inglorious memory, by papists. Besides a popish band in the House of Commons, consisting of thirty-two members, there are twenty-two popish members of the peerage, and forty-five popish Baronets. Popish Judges are now appointed to the bench, and popish priests as chaplains to the army and navy, to prisons and work-houses. Statesmen have gone on step by step, answering the demands of Romanists, and supplying them with money, till now the annual subsidy to the support and propagation of popery, out of the national funds, amounts to £300,000 sterling. You all know, also, the history of the Party Emblem's Bill and its application in Ireland. So partial has that application become that Romanists can, as they did, and that on the Sabbath day, in the city of Dublin, last July, hold party processions, play party music, and display party colors, with impunity; whereas, the least infraction of the Bill, on the part of Protestants, is speedily visited with punishment. This partiality became so great and intolerable, that last September, there assembled in Belfast, some say seventy-five others say one hundred thousand Protestants of the North, with the Venerable Dr. Cook at their head, to petition parliament either to have the law impartially administered or repealed. In short, so much is popery favored and aided, and under such favor and aid, so much has it increased of late in power and in the number and efficiency of its institutions, that it may be said to be virtually re-established in the land. Is not, then, such a course towards popery inconsistent with Great Britain's Protestant constitution? Is such a course politic—is it legal—is it safe? Well, has one said that "they who advise Her Majesty to violate this sworn engagement, and adopt a course that must endanger the Protestant religion, and facilitate the encroachments of Rome, take upon themselves a responsibility of a very grave and perilous character. It cannot be denied, that every popish, and especially every popish priest, is under a positive injunction to do all in his power to *extirpate* the Protestant religion. The church of Rome does not even tolerate Protestantism. She hates it with a deadly and ineradicable virulence, and proclaims against it a war of extermination." The following is a part of the oath taken by every Popish Bishop before his consecration:—"The Roman papacy and the *Royalties* of St. Peter, I will assist to maintain, and defend against every man, the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, and of our Lord, the Pope, and his successors aforesaid. I will be careful to preserve, defend, *enlarge*, and promote; all *heretics*, *schismatics*, and *rebels* against our said Lord and His successors aforesaid, I will, to the *utmost of my power*, persecute and oppose."

But let us now turn to our own country—Canada. Do we find that the course pursued here is any better than that to which we have referred? No, in nowise, but even worse. Let us take a practical example of the course pursued towards popery by a large class of pro-

fessed Protestants; for there is nothing like teaching by example. And what better one can I select than that of the man who has, for the last ten years, on these points, misrepresented myself in his official capacity, as the member of parliament for this city? I have nothing to do with him as a private gentleman and citizen, but I have to do with him as my representative, and did I not protest against his conduct as such, in so far as it has been in the support and propagation of popery, I, myself, would be partaker with him in the sin of maintaining Anti-christ. And what then has been his course in this respect? Has he not invariably been on the side of popery! Has he ever given a vote in the house adverse to the interests of the papacy? Has he not been the best friend of the papacy in Canada West. As he invariably voted against every bill for sabbath reformation, so he invariably voted for every bill for the promotion of popery. But let us come to particulars. You all remember what is called the Gavazzi, but which I call the popish riots, of 1853, in Montreal and Quebec, and which were got up to put down free speech, to take away the right of private judgment and the liberty of the citizens! In Quebec the Protestants were attacked in a Protestant Church in which, I believe, there are marks to be seen this day of their unlawful deeds. What was done to punish the perpetrators of this outrage upon the unoffending Protestants of Quebec? After some efforts failed to secure justice, they approached the highest tribunal in our land, the parliament, by petition, headed with the name of the Rev. Dr. Cook. Who ever had a better claim to be heard and respected and defended by this high tribunal? But did they meet with justice; and were further steps taken to enquire into the conduct of the police Magistrate of Quebec, who, there is every reason to believe, absented himself from the scene of action, that the mob might the better do their work? No, the prayer of their most reasonable petition was refused; and my misrepresentative, on that occasion, opposed it and voted against it.

What has been his invariable course on the Separate School question? The following extract from a letter of the late Bishop Phelan, of date, Kingston, 11th April, 1855, will show his position then, and which has been his position since:—"You informed me, in your last letter, that it is, and always was your object to enable the Catholics of Upper Canada to educate their youth in their own way." In another letter to his brother Bishop, Charbonnel, of date, Kingston, Nov., 1854, he states, "I have had a letter from our Attorney General, in which he promises that he will pass a bill that will be satisfactory to us all." Now what is their own way of educating their own youth, and what is the object of separate schools? Is that way not that of training their youth in the doctrines and ceremonies of their church, and this end to train up their children under exclusively Roman Catholic influences? Let Doctor Ryerson, chief Superintendent of Education for Canada West, bear testimony. And what better testimony could we have! In his Report of the Schools of Upper Canada, for the year 1858, he wrote the Governor General as follows:—"The Separate Schools are established and conducted for exclusively Roman Catholic denominational purposes. The avowed object of these schools is to train up children under exclusively Roman Catholic influences, and to employ a great part of the school time in teaching and practising the ritual elements and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, and also of inculcating betimes that Protestants are at war with God and His Church,

and are subjected to the Divine curses in both worlds. I can easily adduce proof, if occasion requires, that those teachings form a part of the catechetical instruction of the separate schools; and it is with the express view of providing for these instructions and ceremonies, that the separation of Roman Catholic children from other children, and the establishment of separate schools, are advocated. Now, whatever may be the right and liberty of teaching in a free state, or whatever the liberality of the state may grant in aid of schools established for the purpose of imparting such instructions, that a free state or a free municipality should be compelled to support such schools, is a thing unknown in the history of constitutional government, and monstrous in its very conception. What a feeling of indignation would arise in the mind of every Protestant in Upper Canada, of whatever religious persuasion, were it authoritatively proposed to compel the municipalities to levy and collect rates to support schools for the Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or Methodist Churches, though in the Catechisms of not one of them is there a word in regard to either the Roman Catholic Church or Romanists !"

Now let us take a question or two from their own catechism used in these schools. Here is one of them, "published by permission of the Very Rev. W. C. McDonald, V.G." in which there occur the following questions and answers :—Q. "How do you call the true church ? A. *The Holy Catholic Church.*" Q. "Who is the visible head of the Church !" A. "The Pope; who is Christ's Vicar on earth and supreme visible head of the Church." Q. "*Are all obliged to be of the true Church?*" A. "Yes; no man can be saved out of it." Q. "Who are they who do not believe all that God has taught?" A. "Heretics and Infidels." Such is the instruction given in and the end for which Separate Schools are established. According to this instruction of the church that cannot err, in the Separate Schools, as well as, elsewhere, you and I are obliged to be of that church, whose supreme and visible head is the Pope, or we are Heretics, fit only to be classed with Infidels. Her Most Gracious Majesty, the Queen, is also under obligation to be of it, and there can be no great harm in endeavoring to induce her to implement her obligation. The Prince of Wales, too, is under like obligation, and where is the wrong in his visiting the Pope so often, a thing unknown before, for ages, in the history of British Princes, and of inducing him to recognize and fulfil this his obligation, or, at least, come as near doing so as he can? Now, I ask, can any man be a supporter of Separate Schools, can any man vote for special acts of parliament to establish and conduct, and assist with public money, schools for giving such a training to the youth of our country, and not be a supporter of Popery? Nay, can any man approve of the conduct of such, and support them in the general elections of the country, and not be a supporter of popery? Most assuredly not. But my misrepresentative has invariably, for the last ten years, been the strongest supporter in Upper Canada of such schools. He introduced into the Lower House the Separate School Bill of 1855, at the end of the session, when most of the Upper Canada members had left for their homes; nor would he allow time to send a copy of it to Canada West. And when it was moved in amendment "that teachers in the Roman Catholic Separate Schools of Upper Canada shall be British subjects, as provided in regard to all other common school teachers," will it be believed that he and his supporters voted it down? The Jesuits

Friars, Christian Brothers, Nuns and other popish brotherhoods and sisterhoods, will not swear allegiance to the crown of England, and he put into this bill a clause releasing them from taking the oath, so that the church of Rome might, as she is doing, introduce as teachers, into Upper Canada, Christian Brothers and Nuns from foreign and popish countries. In the bill of the present year, it is provided that teachers qualified in Lower Canada shall be qualified in Upper Canada, a privilege which no other teachers possess. In this bill, also, it is acknowledged in the preamble that they have a right to Separate Schools, and various provisions of an extraordinary and special kind, are made to facilitate the establishment and maintainance of such schools. The whole course of my misrepresentative on these points for the last ten years, has been on the side of popery, and well may the papists of Kingston and the county of Frontenac support him.

Again, he has boasted of the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question. But how was it settled? You all know that these funds were designed for the maintenance exclusively of a "Protestant Clergy," and how after the Union of the two Provinces, and by the unfaithfulness of Protestants as well as the influence of Lower Canada, the Church of Rome came to obtain a share of them. Well, there was a fine opportunity at the final settlement of them, of gradually taking from them these Protestant funds by which they were sustaining the Papacy in Upper Canada. Did he avail himself of that only opportunity and do it? No; he introduced into his bill the commutation clause, by which he was enabled to endow, for ever, this Church out of these funds designed exclusively for the maintenance of a "Protestant Clergy," with the sum of not less than \$87,000.

With regard to Popish acts of Incorporation, and Popish grants of money, whose object is none other than the maintenance and propagation of Popery in our land, his course has been always the same. He has aided in giving them all they demanded.

You will not soon forget the attempt of the Duke of Newcastle to apply, most partially, the principle of the Irish Party Emblems Act to Canada. And I have yet to learn that the then Att'y-General West did anything in his official capacity to protect the rights of citizens, of protestants and of orangemen. Had he said, to the Governor General on that occasion, even at the latest hour, either the Prince will land at Kingston, or I will resign my office, and had he done it, would he not have been this day the most popular man among Protestants? But he did not do it, and I hold him responsible, so far as an individual minister can be held responsible, for the course pursued by the Governor General on that occasion, for this, among other reasons, that every minister in Canada is sworn to advise the Crown in all matters relating to Canada, just as much as every British minister is sworn to advise the Crown in all matters relating to Great Britain and Ireland. If his course has been such in relation to the papacy for the last ten years, a course of subserviency, what may we expect from him, if in his power, in relation to the University question? It is proposed to give to Regiopolis at once some \$60,000 and \$10,000 annually afterwards, with a like sum to a Tractarian college in Toronto. If protestants are not vigilant and active in relation to this question, we may have more Roman Catholic Colleges than one endowed out of the funds of our National Institution.

Now, what has been the course, of this one, has been the course of many more professed protestants, and I am sorry to say it, many

sworn orangemen. If you can regard them in any other light you may do so, but I cannot but regard them and all who approve of them and support them in such a course towards anti-Christ, but as supporters of the papacy in our land, and striking a blow of a serious kind at those glorious protestant banners of which we have discoursed, and which have been handed down to us by our forefathers, sprinkled with the blood of millions of martyrs. Let me here read to you the words of a man who possesses the soul of a Protestant, and who, moreover, is a layman and an Orangemen, on which account, I desire the more to give you his sentiments on the present occasion. Many of you will readily recognize him when I inform you that his name is William Johnston, Esquire, of Ballykilbeg House, Downpatrick, Ireland. In a paper, entitled "Practical Protestantism," and given in to the Tri-centenary of the Reformation in Scotland, held in Edinburgh in 1860, he says: "Would any one teach or profess that Christianity should be confined to Sabbath services; that it should not meddle with the shop, that it should not regulate the daily movements, that in common and ordinary matters it should not influence the man"? Ought not then a Christian to be a Protestant? Can he be for Christ and not against anti-Christ? We assert that a man cannot in these lands be a christian without being a Protestant. A feeble christian will feebly protest against anti-Christ: a brave and bold one will act boldly and bravely against anti-Christ. But, in some shape or other, proof must be given that you are for Christ; there must be no denial of him before anti-Christ and his hosts. This is to be a *Protestant*, to remember the religio-political nature of anti-Christ and to meet him with the two-edged sword of religio-politics. Nothing else is Protestantism. . . . Christ is a Prophet, Priest and King; so would be anti-Christ. You deny anti-Christ's teaching; very good; there is little danger in your belief in that. You reject his pretended priesthood, and do well. What about his kingship or rule? Are you equally energetic, then? Do you oppose that, or is it a matter of indifference to you that the crown is taken from the head of Christ and placed on the head of anti-Christ? "But that is politics!" What then? Are you content that Satan should rule the world? And will you be guiltless if, by apathy, you help him to do so? Do you say, "Heaven for God, the devil for the world." This will never do. But this is what every one says who helps by vote or by non-vote, to aid this anti-Christ—the incarnation of Satan, antagonist to God's incarnate Son."

What defence can such men and professed Protestants and even Orangemen make for their pro-popish course? One, and my misrepresentative in these matters, says, in reference to Separate Schools:—Would you prevent the Roman Catholics from educating their children in their own way? How would you, Protestants, like to be deprived of this privilege? "It is and always has been my object to enable the Catholics of Upper Canada to educate their youth in their own way." We have seen what their own way is. These statements may look very plausible to some, and they have proved to be sufficient to satisfy most, if not all, his supporters. But, will this defence stand investigation? Is it not one thing to allow the Romanists to educate their youth in their own way, and quite another to give them special acts of Parliament and special grants of money to enable them to do it? It would have been one thing for the British Government to have allowed the heathen in India to educate their youth and perform religious ceremonies and

acts of worship in their own way, and quite another to assist them, as they did, in various ways as well as by grants of money to do so, which course, among others, brought down the Divine displeasure, and caused Britain's folly and sin, in this respect, to be written in the blood of her noble sons and daughters on the plains of India. Popery is as much a system of idolatry as are the systems of heathenism, only more refined. And ere the Queen could wear the crown she was obliged to make a solemn declaration that she believed the invocation of the Virgin Mary and the Sacrifice of the Mass to be *superstitious* and *idolatrous*. And in supporting and propagating popery in our land we are committing sin, and exposing ourselves, as a nation, to the punishment which idolatry deserves and which it is sure, in this life, to receive. I know of no one who would prevent Romanists from educating their children in their own way. It would be tyranny and persecution to attempt to prevent them, and I, for one, would stand up for their defence, on the principles we have to-day advocated, were any to attempt to deprive them of the right of private judgement and liberty in this matter. Nor would I ask, much less compel them, to support schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. But, on the other hand, no man and no nation can aid them by special acts and grants of Parliament without being implicated in the sin and exposed to the punishment of idolatry. It is inconsistent with the British Constitution, and dangerous to civil and religious liberty. "Religious liberty," says a Romish paper, "in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon the age, by the father of deceit. *The very name of liberty, except in the sense of permission to do certain definite acts, ought to be banished from the domain of religion.* It is neither more nor less than falsehood. *No man has a right to choose his religion.* None but an atheist can uphold the principles of religious liberty. Shall I foster that damnable doctrine that Socinianism and Calvinism and Anglicanism and Judaism, are not mortal sins, like *murder and adultery*? Shall I hold out hopes to my erring Protestant brother that I will not meddle with his creed if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my house, or my horse, or my life blood? No; *Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds.*" And the Bishop of St. Louis writes: "*Catholicity will one day rule America, and then religious liberty is at an end.*" Protestantism of every kind she inserts in her catalogue of mortal sins. She endures it when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to effect its destruction." What a writer has said in relation to Britain may we not say in relation to Canada, namely: "to promote the spread and increase of popery, to confer emoluments on its priesthood, and to vote the public money for its propagation, is then unconstitutional, illegal, impolitic and dangerous, an invasion of our chartered rights, an act of treason against the State, and a crime against God." Yet such is the flimsy sophistry wherewith many are willingly blinded and induced to aid in pursuing a similar course of popish sustentation and propagation by my misrepresentative.

Another, and sad to say that other is not only a Protestant but an Orangemen, and, alas! your own Grand Master, has lately made his defence before the Grand Lodge assembled lately in Belleville. His first argument is, in a few words, namely: that Separate Schools have

existed since 1843 ; I have on former occasions supported them without being censured for it ; therefore, I am justified in supporting them now. Popist Colleges, for the training of young men for the priesthood have existed in Canada much longer, would he feel justified in supporting them ? Manooth has existed longer than either, would he therefore support it and its princely endowment on the floor of the British Parliament ? And will forbearance and the neglect of a duty on your part justify him in persuing a course which so evidently sustains and propogates popery ? Most assuredly not. It is a wonder that such a man would advance, for a moment, such an argument. But his second and only other argument, we have seen, is much worse. We will give it you in his own words : “ I take, he says, “ the true principle of civil and religious liberty to be that the State shall not coerce the conscience of any man. I take that principle to be as much a part of our Institution, as it is of the Institution of the State, and the right of private judgment, and the free course of the Scriptures, which we maintain as Protestants are all bound up in the principle. The Roman Catholic declares that it is against his conscience to seperate religious from secular education ; he says that such is the teaching of his Church, and however, we as Protestants may believe that teaching, his faith is, that it is true. He claims that as a part of religious liberty which the civil government has given him, that the conscience of his child shall not be subjected to secular teaching only, and he asks that his own rates, and taxes only, not a farthing of any Protestant shall be allowed him for that purpose.” Such another tissue of sophistry and false representation we have not seen for a long time. It appears to be taken for granted, in the first place, that our Common School law coerces the children of Roman Catholics to attend the Common Schools, whereas we know of no law that coerces either Protestants or Romanists to send their children to them. Not only so, but the law leaves it with the inhabitants of a school section or municipality to say whether they shall have, at all, any Common Schools. Again, it is also taken for granted that our Common School law compels children that may attend them to receive only secular education, whereas, such is not the fact. It provides that, “ no person shall require any pupil in any such school to read or study in or from any religious book, or to join in any exercise of devotion or religion objected to by his or her parents or guardians ; but, within this limitation, pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instructions as their parents and guardians desire, according to any general regulations provided for the government of Common Schools.” Of this provision the Chief Superintendent says, “ the principle of religious instruction in the schools is recognized, the restrictions within which it is to be given are stated, and the exclusive right of each parent and guardian on the subject is secured.” In the regulations by the Council of Public Instruction, of which one Roman Catholic Bishop is a member, it is further provided, “ that the Clergy of any persuasion, or their authorized representatives, shall have the right to give religious instruction to the pupils of their own church, in such common school house, at least once a week, after the hour of four o'clock in the afternoon.” Even were there no such provisions, and were there no religious instruction given in the common schools, it would not follow that the conscience of any child must, at the same time, receive only secular teaching. May not his parents at home, and his priest and others, give him, at the same time

he is receiving a secular, a religious training?

Farther, he states, that the Romanist "asks his own rates and taxes only, not a farthing of any Protestant, shall be allowed him for that purpose." Now, not to say anything about the Legislative grant, the municipal appropriation and who contributes most to the public and municipal funds, the Bill of 1863, provides that Separate Schools shall participate in any other municipal appropriation for school purposes. Many of the municipalities appropriate what they receive from the Clergy Reserves to Common School purposes, and thus, Separate Schools will, by this Bill, share, unless municipalities refuse to appropriate these funds any longer for the purpose, in funds originally and exclusively set apart for the maintenance of a Protestant clergy. But what is the real argument contained in this portion of his defence? Is it not the conscience of a Roman Catholic? And what and where is the conscience of a papist? Is it not what the priest makes it, and is it not in the hands of the priest? It is against the conscience of Roman Catholics to separate religion, from secular instruction; therefore, I am justified, in aiding them in carrying out their consensuous convictions by supporting Separate Schools? And is it not against their conscience that our Bible exists, and that we make a free use of it? Hence many thousands of copies have been by them committed to the flames, and, had they the power, not a copy of it would be left us, from which to learn the will of God and the way of salvation; for they teach their children Catechism used in Separate Schools, that "numberless heresies and improprieties, as also many rebellious and civil wars ensue from an unrestricted reading of the Bible, in vulgar languages by the unlearned and unstable." Is it not against their conscience that Bible Societies and Bible readers exist and do their appropriate work? Hence Bulls have been issued against Bible Societies, and Bible readers have been denounced from their altar. Was it not against their conscience that James, the I, and his parliament existed in 1605? Hence "the Gunpowder—Treason, and Guy Fawkes was encouraged and prepared by the sacraments of their church administered to him by the hands of a priest, for the final accomplishment of the diabolical plot. How sad that any man of education should use such an argument; but how much more so, that a professed champion of Protestantism and the Grand Master of Orangemen should do so, and that others and Orangemen too, could accept it as a satisfactory vindication of his course in supporting Separate Schools, which are just so many little manooths in our land! Viewed either in the light of reason or Protestantism, his arguments are alike, unworthy of the learned gentleman who uttered them, and discreditable to the body of which he is the Grand Master.*

*Popery, The Enemy of Common Schools, by Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D. D. page 63:—"Let us look, another moment, at this plea of *conscience*! Far be it from us to be intolerant towards any religion which is properly and only a religion. But what if it be a wily political system, under the guise of religion? What if it be Bishop O'Connor's conscience to cut off my head for opinion's sake? Shall I yield to this on the plea of religion? Let me call attention to the fact, that this is not a simple case of conscience. It is complicated with Jesuitical plots, and with perils to our liberties. The very same stratagem is now used in Europe, to crush all free principles. He may call it intolerance, that we would resist foreign machinations in our beloved land, while

I am convinced that he is wrong, & that Protestants are
 conscience is clear that which he is wrong & will hold from
 them if he had the power to do so - viz - full religious liberty

the records of history are so plain, and the cry of new victims wakes universal sympathy, and makes the very Turk blush for a religion like this. Do we not read? Do we not sometimes see for ourselves? I have seen the gratings of the Inquisition, in the rear of the Pope's lordly Vatican, and under the eaves of his cathedral at Rome; and all for religion, forsooth. And what are we to think, when, in the face of all documents, and all facts—in the face of fresh victims every hour, whose groans come over to us from the Pope's dominions, and even in direct contradiction of his own organ here—the Bishop tells us that he “knows nothing in his religion that would teach him to hate any one.” “We teach, to be sure,” he adds, “that God has made a revelation; that the church is the organ by which he communicates it, and that all, under pain of sin, are bound to hear her voice.” Mark the words, *Bound under pain of sin*, to hear the Romish Church's voice! We understand! Here is the dogma, which contains in it the death warrant of the millions who have fallen victims to Papal power. The holy butchery is not for hatred, forsooth, but for *love*! This is the meaning of brotherly love which the Bishop accepts in careful distinction from anything universal. And he comes to us talking gently as a cooing dove. Let us quote from the Standard school book of the Romanists, entitled “A Synopsis of Moral Theology, as prepared for Romish Seminaries and Students of Theology.” “Question. Are heretics rightly punished with death? Answer. St. Thomas answers, Yes. Because forgers of money, and other disturbers of the State, are justly punished with death; therefore, also heretics, who are forgers of the faith, &c.” “This is the moral and religious instruction considered so important to the dear children, by the Bishops! Hear the *Shepard of the Valley*, speaking out, with no Jesuitical concealment or mystification: “Heresy and unbelief are crimes, that's the whole matter; and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the public laws of the land, they are punished as other crimes.” I accept his admission, therefore, as quite to the point. “If any ones religion,” he says, “teaches this hatred and strife, I think it may be safely asserted, that whatever portion of it he may fail to communicate to his children, he will, without doubt, communicate this successfully.”

The Bishop thinks that “Arithmetic and Geomtry” may be taught without the aid of Romish priests. He has probably heard of Cardinal Wiseman's discovery, lately broached at an English *Soiree*—that the history of Galileo's persecution by the Romish Church, is all a mistake! But, alas for the Bishop, *how little can be taught* in these American public schools! The difference between sins mortal and sins venial—cannot be taught. The superiority of the Romish clergy to all civil law—cannot be taught. The virtue of perjury, when done in the service of the Romish Church—cannot be taught. The emptiness of the oath of allegiance to a Protestant state—cannot be taught. And such precious school books as “Den's Moral Theology” and authors of such precious morality as Liguori—cannot pass the inspection of these “tyranical majorities.” Alas! alas!

What makes it so unrightious (so “unconstitutional and despotic, as the” *Freeman's Journal* has it)—to have public education done here by the State? Just because the State here happened to be Protestant—that is all. Do we not know that in Papal States, just now, it is only the State education, as by law established, that will answer these very

gentlemen of the Romish hierarchy? So they make fish of one and flesh of another.

We confess freely—that *because this is the Roman Catholic religion and this the priestly conscience*, for which this official of Rome demands such special privileges, we invoke against it the resistance of American free men. We know this step—this favorable step for controlling society and government, to seize upon the public instruction, and to break down all other plans. We resist at the threshold, just because to use his own illustration, his calf is on our shoulders, and full well we know that we shall not be able to carry it when it becomes an ox !”

What is it to be a Protestant? Is it not to speak against popery, to make great professions of Protestant principles without doing what we can in opposition to Antichrist and in support of the Kingdom of Christ. What is it to be an Orangeman? Is it to wear such and such colors on certain occasions, and to speak loudly against the Pope, without possessing the soul of an Orangeman, which is always, and in all places, instinctively opposed to popery and on the side of Protestantism? Orangemen, your oath is before me—you are sworn to support and defend, to the utmost of your power, Her Majesty the Queen, in the Sovereignty of Great Britain and Ireland, and of these provinces, so long as “she shall support and maintain the Protestant religion.” Can you then advise her and help her to make special laws and special grants to enable the popish hierarchy the better to support their institutions, to teach the dogmas of popery and propagate the pernicious principles of Antichrist? Can you approve of the conduct of those who do so? No, no. You are sworn opponents of all enemies to her Majesty and the constitution of Great Britain, and that constitution is decidedly and essentially Protestant. Can you then directly or indirectly support that which is not only inconsistent with, but the very opposite of the Protestant principles of that Glorious Constitution under which it is our privilege to live? You are the sworn supporters of the connection that subsists between this and the mother country. In this connection with the Protestant Constitution of Great Britain there is much of safety for our common Protestantism. Can you then support that which tends to weaken, if not sever this connection? But the support given to Popery by our rulers, the ruling of Upper Canada by the Papists of Lower Canada, in matters purely Upper Canadian, and the extravagance of a past Government, in that it has led to the imposition of a high tariff on British goods, so that the question with many, in Great Britain and Ireland at present is, “What profit is Canada to us, seeing it does not afford a profitable market for our manufacturies?” do tend to weaken, if not sever, this connection. We believe the men of your order, in general, are sound Protestants, and that they desire to do all they can to uphold and wave over this land our Common Protestant Banners, and to oppose directly and indirectly the aggressions of Popery. But we cannot but say, and we would not be doing what we believe to be a duty to you, this day, did we not say, that too often they have been made use of, and your organization has been made use of in the interests of Popery, by cunning, designing, selfish men, who are ready to sell their Protestant birthright for a mess of pottage, if so be they thereby may accomplish their own selfish and ambitious purposes. It is sad that Orangemen can, with any show of ruth, be twitted on the floor of Parliament, with going to their consti-

tuents with "an Orange ticket in one pocket and a Roman Catholic certificate in the other." We call upon you by all the memory of the past, and by all that is dear to you in the present, to rally anew around our Glorious Protestant Banners, which have "braved the battle and the breeze" for more than three thousand years—to help, in every legitimate and constitutional way, to bear them upward and onward, in the church, in the world, at the polls, in parliament, in the city, and in the country, until the cry is made, "Babylon, the great, is fallen, is fallen, and shall be found no more at all"—until "Jesus," our covenanted King and only mediator, "shall reign where ere the sun doth his successive journeys run." Finally, let us say, this day, with hearts full of gratitude to Him who has ever been on the side of Protestantism, "We will rejoice in thy salvation, and in the name of our God will we set up our Banners."



